BRENDA BREWER:	Good day, everyone. Welcome to the BC Membership call on 15 February 2024 at 16:00 UTC. Today's call is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.
	Please state your name before speaking and have your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking. Attendance is taken from Zoom participation. We just learned of Chris Lewis-Evans's apology for today's call. And I'll turn the meeting over to BC chair, Mason Cole. Thank you.
MASON COLE:	Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. Mason Cole here, chair of the BC. Good to have you all on the call on 15 February. This is our last meeting before we meet again in Puerto Rico, so it's good to have you on the call.
	Our agenda for the morning is up on the screen. Are there any updates or requests or additions to the agenda, please? Okay. I don't see any hands. Oh, Steve Crocker, please.
STEVE CROCKER:	Thank you. Sorry to be tardy on that. Some of us are trying to put together a session for people who've had experience or have thoughts about the request side of the RDRS. As we get the pieces together, we'll send out invitations and notice of where it is and so forth. I think that there is more than just me working on it. I think there's already been

some communication with you guys, leadership. So you may know about it already. So I'm happy to talk about it or not as you wish.

MASON COLE: Sure. Thank you, Steve. Can we do that under AOB? Do you mind?

STEVE CROCKER: Not at all.

STEVE DELBIANCO: We can even do it during the RDRS discussion.

MASON COLE: That's true, Steve. Yeah, thanks. Why don't we do that? Let's do that. Can you call on—

STEVE CROCKER: Anywhere you say.

MASON COLE: Yeah. Steve, go ahead and call on Steve Crocker in that part of the session, if you would. Okay. Thank you, Steve Crocker. I appreciate that. Anyone else? All right, thank you very much. Let's go to item number two. Steve DelBianco, the floor is yours, please.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Mason. I've got the policy calendar displayed right now. Since our last meeting, we've filed four different items. I'll work from top down. Most recently, which is earlier this week, we commented on the ICANN plans for Fiscal Year '25 as well as '25 through '29. Now, Tim Smith did a lion's share of the drafting, Lawrence came in with several good edits, Steve Crocker made an edit, and we got those in on Monday. Thanks again, Tim, for taking the lead on that. Very much appreciated.

On Sunday, we commented on the Fiscal Year '25 Op Plan and Budget just for PTI, the Public Technical Identifiers. Good comment drafted by Arinola with Segun's help. Thank you.

And on 8th of February, we commented on the draft report for the continent of Africa as a domain name industry and the study that ICANN had commissioned. David Snead did a fabulous job with drafting with Lawrence's help, where we gave very specific call-outs to things we recognized. We made some suggestions for changes. Now we'll monitor to see if they listen to anything we've asked for. We discussed this on a call two weeks ago.

Also on the 8th of February, we submitted a letter to European Commission, DG Justice in particular. Mason, thank you for drafting that. Faisal, I believe, also helped with edits. This was, I think, about six years after the GDPR fines system went into place in 2018. European Commission wants to say, "Well, how's it going? How's it going?" So it was an opportunity to reiterate our belief of overinterpretation by some parties such as ICANN, in particular ways in which the Commission should clarify and maybe even revise the way it's enforcing GDPR.

Thanks, again to all the great work, four very significant comments we got in. So turning to what is open right now, before the 23rd of February, so we still have time, we are going to submit to the ICANN Board answers to questions they've posed to us. They want us to look at the proposed framework for Registry Voluntary Commitments and Public Interest Commitments, and the plan they have for how to implement those. That plan is missing a lot of details. So mostly what we're commenting on are the parts that they've not yet addressed yet, because I really believe that the Public Interest Commitments in SubPro team never finished their work. They didn't describe what happens if an objection is not resolved by a nation. They didn't resolve what happens with promises that are made that might require enforcement to look at the content on a website that resolves to a TLD. So we have been working on this for several weeks already. We have a very extensive document. I'll just give you a hint about it, show you what it looks like real quick.

This is the Google Doc and you all have a link to it. In this Google Doc, we have the opportunity to answer the questions, yes/no, and then provide explanations and answers. So, so far, we've had great participation in here for Chris Lewis-Evans, Margie Milam, Steve Crocker, myself, Alan Woods, but all the BC members are on notice since we've distributed this. This is the time to weigh in with clarifications, you can see what I said here to Chris Lewis-Evans, "Chris, it's not clear what you meant by this." Chris gives me a great example. We're going to work that into the document. But all of you are invited to attend to this Doc and help us to give ICANN a roadmap as to how

they should resolve the final policymaking which is missing on RVCs and PICs.

At a high level, we want to be sure that if an applicant needs to make promises of integrity with respect to the registrants who were allowed or integrity with respect to the content and conduct that happens, that if they get the GAC or governments to resolve their objections in exchange for making those commitments, then ICANN has to be able to enforce them. We want to find a way that ICANN get enforce conduct restrictions and registrant restrictions where it may have to look at content to determine if the conduct is unlawful. You don't necessarily want to say that ICANN's Bylaws need to be changed in some way. That is not going to go well. I believe we would work backwards. We were to seek a Bylaws change to allow ICANN to enforce and regulate content. If anybody disagrees, speak up now because we're going to answer no to that question. I'm watching for the chat to see if any of you are weighing in or if the participants want to talk right now. Any hands up on this one? Alan? Others who are working on it? This is a good time to speak up. Steve Crocker, you first.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Just very simply, ICANN isn't going to change its Bylaws to get into content enforcement per se. But as we talked about it, it could get into the business of saying, "If you say you're going to enforce content, then there better be a mechanism for that." We've talked about all that before. But the line is pretty strict and very, very deep. You're not going to get anybody to cross that line with respect to getting ICANN to get directly involved in content control. Thanks.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Steve. Because they asked similar types of content restrictions that could be proposed. We say yes, there are some that could be proposed, and we explain how. We are but stopping short of suggesting that they change the Bylaws. As Steve said, that would not work. Okay. Any other comments on this? Margie, please.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi. I wanted to weigh in on this as well. The Bylaws are sufficient. It has fairly broad language, including putting a grandfathering clause that refers to the prior PICs in the previous round, as well as noting that future contracts that are consistent with those are within ICANN's Bylaws and mandate. So there's no reason to change the Bylaws, it's really a function of ICANN's compliance as to whether it's willing to do more than it does today. That's why I think the answer should still be no, let's not change the Bylaws. Let's just encourage compliance to do what it can to enforce the contracts.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Margie. Any other comments on this? We're going to be submitting this via a Google Form on Feb. 23rd. I will probably send out a last call on the 20th or so to see if any of you want to weigh in one more time. But it's coming together pretty nicely. All right, I'll stop that share. Let's go back to the policy calendar right now. Thank you.

The next item up is the Name Collisions Analysis Project or NCAP. So this is a project that started on the last round, and it was largely due to the

EN

BC being very concerned about collisions between new TLDs and what we'll call internal domain names on intranet, some extranets in companies. Those collisions then will cause unpredictable behavior, and perhaps even result in diverted traffic.

So they have done another study, Study 2. We had commented on Study 1, myself and Mark Svancarek, four years ago in March. So it is long overdue for us to take a peek at Study 2. Those comments close at the end of February, so we've got two weeks. Do we have any volunteers that would be willing to work with me to try to address these name collisions? Looking at the list in the chat to see if we've got anybody else that could help. Hand up from Vivek. Go ahead, Vivek.

VIVEK GOYAL: Just volunteering to help, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Vivek. I appreciate that very much. This is on number two, collisions. Thank you. Any others? Thanks, Vivek.

Number three, the EPDP on IDNs or Internationalized Domain Names. BC members, these are domain names. After the dot, don't use the Latin script representation, but rather other languages and scripts. The key is the word script there. They represent it through ASCII codes of X and dash, dash. But the whole point here is that we want to do more and more domain names in non-Latin scripts.

Their final report in their EPDP came in. Ching, you did all the lifting on our comment last June on Phase 1. This is just the final report for Phase

EN

---

1. So all we have to do is to look at things that we asked them to change and see whether they did and comment on that. I don't believe this is a huge lift for us, given all the work that, Ching, that you put in earlier. Would you be willing to work with me on that one?

CHING CHIAO: Hi, Steve. Yes, for sure. Yeah. I'm happy to help again.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Fantastic. Thank you on number three. I appreciate that.

Next one up already has a volunteer, Crystal Ondo. Crystal is on the line. Thanks again for volunteering on that. It's a really narrow element about proposing that the TLD string .internal be reserved for private use. Therefore, no one else is going to bid on it. Crystal, thank you for volunteering on that. Are there are others who want to assist and weigh in on that? Crystal, your hand is up. Go ahead, please.

CRYSTAL ONDO: I just wanted to put a call out that my comment will probably be supportive of reserving .internal. So if there's any BC member that has a different take on this, please do reach out ondo@google.com or I'll start a draft doc and share it around. We have a lot of weeks still for this. But I am aware that many large companies do use .internal already, Google Cloud being one of them. I've heard through the grapevine that other large companies also use it as well. So I'm proposing that the BC support this reservation, but open to the discussion.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It dovetails a bit with the notion of collisions, doesn't it? That .internal were big for as a new TLD, it creates collisions, avoid the collisions by reserving it. Thank you, Crystal. This is a good time for any BC member that thinks the .internal should be out there as an open application. Let us know right now because we're heading down a path to support the recommendation. Thanks, Crystal.

Lastly, we discussed this two weeks ago. The ExCom believes that we should pick up on some things that were said in Hamburg. When we raised concerns about NIS2, we did it in a Day Zero event. We did it with the CSG meeting with the Board of directors, Becky Burr for the Board, as well as the Contracted Party House, sort of led the Board's pushback on what we were saying, and on Day Zero, Elena Plexida, for the purposes of Org, push back by claiming that ICANN didn't need to do anything. We would like to sort of reposition those statements that were made, try to find a way to either have ICANN reconsider that. We were thinking we were trying to get the Board to go on record. But a lot of this change, right? Mason drafted a letter which we circulated on the 5th of February, which was really working in the vacuum of how little had been said and tried to stir a response from ICANN. And when that comment was circulated, we had more folks, those of us that were concerned about it, and then a couple that supported the draft, Margie and Patrick, for instance.

So, Mason and I were discussing how are we going to resolve these differences, and then suddenly the Board comes back with a question for all of CSG. The question is right here on the screen. Marie, it was

part of your CSG update so I'm covering it here, if you don't mind. But this particular language here where the Board wants us to speak to, areas of ICANN policy that are inconsistent or where there's a mandate for ICANN through its public interest to try to make some changes, what else can I do to help the contracted parties to comply with NIS2 since that compliance is not going to be required but what is in the current contracts. So we don't have to vote on something. I think the new question as well as the very thoughtful pushback that several of us have given to the letter put this back into the drafting category. Mason still holds the pen and will draft the response now.

As opposed to picking up on things that were said in Hamburg, I think our response now is to specifically address the questions that have come up in the highlighted section to the Board. So we would want to go into San Juan with a very definitive answer. If we develop it quickly enough, I'd love to send it to them ahead of time. We certainly would share it with our CSG colleagues because it would be the highlight of the discussion between the Board and CSG when we're in San Juan. So that's the thing, we don't need to go into great detail here. But I welcome a comment or two from those who want to weigh in. I see hands up from Mason, and then Steve Crocker so far. Mason, you first.

MASON COLE: Thanks, Steve. I appreciate the background on this. Your characterization of where we are on the process is exactly right. We were fortuitous to get the question that we did from the ICANN Board. I want to say that I appreciate all the feedback from Steve and Alan and Crystal and everyone else. The letter is going to be revised for

publication to the Board prior to San Juan. We will be teeing this up with the CSG as well so that we have a fruitful discussion with the Board and the CSG in San Juan. I encourage everyone in the BC to be at that meeting, it's going to be very important. So yeah, I don't want to go too far down a rabbit hole here because the letter needs to be updated and revised, and it will be published back to the BC list for discussion before we get to San Juan. Thanks, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Mason. Thank you. Over to next hand I saw up was Steve Crocker, then Alan Woods.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. There's a kind of a split point of view here. On the one hand, there is the "What do we have to do to comply? Are we in compliance? And if we are, then we're done" point of view, which I think is what's expressed in the Board's response. I think that that is also the point of view expressed by some of us. The other side of this is NIS2 can be read both as a forthcoming legal requirement, but it can also be read as a kind of aspiration or a suggestion about these things are good. And that raises the question of whether or not we, in various configurations of we, think that this is a good idea and would push for saying, "Hey, we ought to do this because it's the right thing to do." There's, as I say, a schism there between waiting until you're forced or finding a way that it doesn't fall within what's forced versus saying, "Hey, we're in the business of trying to do the right thing for the for the Internet users." How do we want the whole system to behave? Not just how do we

EN

conform to the minimum requirements enforced by law and the ICANN Bylaws? The dialogue that's represented here is all of the former kind, and some of us at least would like to see us take on the leading question of, well, how best can we serve the Internet community and what's the best way to organize ourselves to do that, and raise the level of trust and utility and sort of maturity in our in our whole ecosystem here. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's a good, positive message. If we look at GDPR is good policy, we should look at NIS2 as even better because it has the benefit of looking back on how they implemented GDPR and the correcting some things. So we ought to pay attention to that. I completely get it.

STEVE CROCKER: Just a quick comment on GDPR. GDPR is a very specific effort and action by the by the European Commission. One could look at that two ways: as a legal framework that we have to conform to, okay, or you can look at it also as, okay, privacy is important. This is their particular way of getting at it with a kind of a sledgehammer and not specific to our environment we could have, and I think we still should look at that as what can we do to take privacy as a serious consideration and how would we want to implement that? Then that raises questions about whether there's any differences, but I don't think we've done the work of thinking through. If you've set GDPR aside, what would you do to try to reach the same level of intent? And then you'd have some interesting things to talk about in terms of implementation, and so forth.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Steve. Allan Woods, and then Margie Milam.

ALAN WOODS: Thank you very much. Number one, thank you to everybody for enduring my e-mails, and then going through them. Obviously, I have my own viewpoints on this matter, but I think Steve actually put it out exceptionally well there. Really, where I'm coming from, now that I'm becoming and trying to become part of the BC and add my hopefully uniqueness to this, is also making sure that we represent the best possible foot forward. I think Steve put it perfectly there, and that is we're all working towards the good of the Internet as a whole. The ability that the Board has now provided us is allowing us not to wax lyrical, but to respond and to have thoughtful discussion on this with all stakeholders involved, and be able to not try and push the envelope, but just to work with others in order to get the envelope where it needs to go. So, actually, I welcome this opportunity, and I look forward to the conversation. But again, thank you to everybody.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thanks, Alan. So I can tell Mason that it might be constructive to move this to a Google Doc. Even though you're holding the pen, Google Doc where people can provide comments or suggestions to work this towards the next form. But when you're ready, I would just invite that and help you to manage the comments that come in.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay, Margie? And then we'll close this topic, please.

MARGIE MILAM: Hi, everyone. I shared my view on the list. I took a look at the Bylaws—not the Bylaws, those were actually the contracts—to see what is the standard for a Temp Spec. What's nice about the standard that it put from the RAA is that it doesn't necessarily require a conflict per se. I know we keep using that language, but it actually doesn't require that. It's a different standard. It just so happens that when GDPR was adopted and WHOIS policy was sort of put on hold while the Temp Spec was adopted and the EPDP came forward to amend the policy that they use the word conflict, but that's not to standard. I think it's important for us as we go into the meeting to ensure that we're talking about the terms correctly and we're pointing out where the policy could be updated.

As I look at the current policy as compared to NIS2, I see gaps that I think would be fruitful to address through the policy processes, because it does create a burden both on registries and registrars that would be very difficult to satisfy without a global policy. Then I also looked to the benefits of those that are the requester community and the benefits of having a global policy, not just one that's focused on the EU. So I'm looking forward to providing continued comments and suggestions on the letter, and I think it's going to be a great conversation in San Juan.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Margie. I appreciate the way you position that. It's not the way the original draft look. The original draft used rhetoric light. We did a Temp Spec in 2018. So we have to do one now that compliance was necessary. But the way you just expressed it is exactly right. The standard for a Temporary Specification is almost anything the Board wants it to be because it's public interest driven. The fact that we did want in 2018, that was justified on the basis of not forcing contracted parties to break GDPR. It doesn't mean that that's the new standard. It doesn't. It's a precedent but we can't cite that precedent in this case because nothing in the current policies would force a contracted party to violate the NIS2 transposition.

So a lot of what Alan and I and Crystal push back on was the suggestion that, ICANN, you have to do one. And once we back away from that rhetoric and start using the notion of we ought to do this, oh, and we can do this, given the way the Temp Spec works. I think we have a good a good avenue to take. I appreciate that comment very much.

All right, moving on. The next one up is on NIS2. Sven, you're on the line, so is Marie. Is there anything new on the transposition of NIS2 that you can share with your colleagues? Marie? Go ahead, Sven.

SVEN ECHTERNACH: NIS2 is not so specific. So each member state, I'm speaking for Germany, has some possibilities to interpret things this way or another way, especially regarding verification. So NIS2 does not define what's happening if the validation or verification is showing that some data is

EN

incorrect. So in Germany, the idea would be if data is incorrect, put domains at a two-week suspension period, and then eventually have it deleted. But give everyone a possibility to fix the data. So first of all, the registrar, and then the registrar has to contact the domain owner. And there are also other fields where the guideline could be a bit more specific. Well, there's a lot of possibilities with this or the other way. And maybe we can have our own thinking how we can guide those states into the right direction what we want.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I have a question for clarification. Do you believe they will restrict the new reg to .de registrants, or will they extend it to any registrant serving users or registrants in the nation of Germany? Will they just be ccs or will it be any gTLD serving the people of Germany and businesses of Germany?

SVEN ECHTERNACH: I think, primarily, it's about .de. Of course, the question is also what will be the database to validate if a street is correct or if the registrant is existing, and it will be easier to do it for the home country than doing it for someone overseas. But eventually, I have the connection to DENIC which is managing .de, and possibly it will be extending to all TLDs.

STEVE DELBIANCO: That is helpful, the extent to which it goes outside of the cc space. Marie, anything to add on NIS2?

MARIE PATTULLO: Nothing since last week, Steve.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Thank you, Marie. All right, moving now to Council. That Council meeting is today, 21:00 UTC. I put in the four or five items from the agenda that I looked at, which looked to be interesting, but I would want to turn to our councilors on the call right now, Mark and Lawrence, to walk us through what you have to decide later today.

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Thank you, Steve. Later today, the votes that we have basically have to do with deferring the reconstitution of the Accuracy Scoping Team. The discussion has been that pending the publication of the INFERMAL study on maliciously registered domains, the implementation of NIS2 Directive, and completion of the Data Processing Agreement, which hopefully might see a DPA appointed within ICANN, the Scoping Team should be held for another six months. I believe that that will be the popular votes for today's Council meeting.

Also, we have a BC member and councilor, Mark, who will be stepping in as the mentor for the Fellowship Program. Previously, we've had another BC member, Arinola Akinyemi, in this position. I'm happy to see these seats retained within the BC.

Up for discussion also today, we hope to receive an update on the SubPro Small Team from Paul McGrady. I think the evolving discussions that we're looking at happen to be around the NCAP collision that Steve

touched earlier. I will be happy to receive feedbacks around this, and to know what direction to tilt the discussions within Council.

Another interesting policy that looks like it's going to be receiving so much attention and work happens to be the EDDP, the Expired Domain Deletion Policy, and Expired Registration Recovery Policy. I understand that the NIS2 Directive might be directly impacting on the policy as it is presently structured. So there is some appetite to have some additional rewording and work on. So I guess that this should be of interest also to the BC. We'll be happy to be guided on our thoughts around that.

I will also be sharing in the charts the Council meetings, the Council schedule, so to say, for the next public meeting. For members who might be interested to follow the Council's work, that will be very helpful for agendas, either remotely or not.

I don't know if anyone has any question or might want to chip in one or two things with regards to the items before Council.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Any questions? All right, thank you, Lawrence. I appreciate it. Lawrence, are you inclined then to recommend voting yes on six month deferral for Accuracy?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: Yes, I am.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Any BC member wants to question that decision and discuss it now? Thanks, Lawrence. Fully support it. All right, other Council activities. Zak and Arinola, you are up to give us an update on latest developments in the Transfer Policy Working Group.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: Okay. Thank you very much, Steve. So last time we spoke about the Transfer Policy Working Group in the BC. Steve had suggested that I mention to the working group that the BC may end up writing its own Minority Report if things continue to go in an unexpected and undesirable direction in terms of change of registrant policies and locks. So I took you up on that advice, Steve, and I did expressly… Yeah, well, it wasn't a video call so I couldn't gauge their reaction. But I did make the threat. All right, well, it is what it is. We'll see how it goes.

But just to give you a little bit more flavor of where things stand. Now, we're not at a consensus call yet. But we're getting into the nitty-gritty of the remaining change of registrant proposals. The way it's looking now is that there's not going to be any locks for a change of registrant, as I mentioned last time. There's going to be notices that registrants can opt out of. So in other words, we're not talking about using the Auth-Code now called the Transfer Authorization Code to change from one registrant to another registrant at a different registrar. We're just talking about material changes to the name of the registrant, the organization, the e-mail address, the phone number, stuff like that. So if there's a change made to that, registrants will have the ability to opt out of receiving any notifications of those changes. So very different

than if you make a change at your bank or your newspaper subscription, for example.

The registrants will be given an opportunity to make an informed conscientious decision. So it's not going to be a default, it's not going to be embedded into the Registration Agreement. It's going to require proactive, supposedly informed choice by the registrant to opt out of those. The rationale is that some registrants don't want to receive these notices, etc. I find it a little difficult to believe, but some registrants don't, particularly corporate registrants at a corporate boutique registrar like CSC, for example. That was one of the examples given.

So now, let's say that there is no opt out of the notices to registrant and there's a change. Let's say that Steve DelBianco's domain name used to be registered to Steve DelBianco. And now someone's managed to get in there and change it to John Smith. There will be a notification going out. But who will the notification go to? You would expect it would go to the former registrant name, Steve, but suppose the guy changes it from Steve DelBianco to John Smith and changes the e-mail address? So the notice is only going to go to the new registrant name, the new registered e-mail address.

Sounds a little crazy? Yeah, not exactly. The New York Post has more secure changes to subscriptions than this. So it's hard to believe but that's the way it's going. And it's heavily registrar focused group. So we'll have a bit of fun in store for us when time comes to have a consensus call and when the time comes to write a Minority Report on this. Any questions? I'd be happy to try to answer them. And Arinola, if you have anything you'd like to add, now's the time. Please go ahead.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Margie said, "Yikes," in the chat. I'll let go of that one. Steve Crocker, please.

STEVE CROCKER: I was participating in the early period on this working group. My focus there was related to making sure that the DNS service transferred properly along with the transfer, and then I dropped off. I feel embarrassed because this issue falls, in my view, squarely in the kinds of things that SSAC ought to be helpful about. So, Zak, let's communicate separately, and I will try to drop back in and also engage my colleagues. Jim Galvin is also part of the Transfer Working Group. He's coming from, I think, in that capacity from the registry side.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH: That's great to hear. Thank you so much. Last thing, though, I'll just add, Steve, is that ALAC is going to be having a session that's partially about this on Saturday, March 2, in Puerto Rico. It's going to be at 4:15 in the afternoon. It's, as I mentioned, only in part about the Transfer Policy Working Group.

The other part, which may be of equal or greater interest is about the draft Applicant Support Program handbook. So that's something you may want to fill in on your ICANN schedule if you have a chance. Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Thank you, Zak and Arinola. Note that Margie would help if it comes time to rationalize the Minority Report, which can be quite extensive, if it comes to that.

ZAK MUSCOVITCH:	Thank you, Margie.

STEVE DELBIANCO:	All right, next item up is the Continuous Improvement Program. Nenad, I do not see you on the call. So we don't have a report on that.

I'll move down to the RDRS, where you have Steve D and Steve C both working on that. A lot of this we covered on our last call. And I've heard further explanations from Patrick Flaherty at Verizon on specific concerns that they raised. We, Steve and I, are glad to carry suggestions for improvements to the system, although it doesn't feel as if staff is particularly receptive to make changes to a drop-down list, for example, it changes the way processes work. Steve Crocker knows and was talking about it.

We have our next call on this RDRS Standing Team on Monday, the 26th. Steve, you probably know, a lot of you in Washington know, that's the day that NetChoice cases are in front of the U.S. Supreme Court. I will not be on that call. So, Steve Crocker, I hope that your calendar accommodates that to represent both SSAC and the BC on the 26th.

STEVE CROCKER: I will take a close look. I'll be coming back from a short vacation the evening before. I'll look closely at this, and you and I can chat.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Steve, why don't you take us now down the notion of organizing requesters so that we can have a more of a consolidated and influential role to play here? Go ahead. This is what you brought up at the beginning of the call.

STEVE CROCKER: What I was trying to bring up, I'm not sure it matches exactly. Maybe there's two different things here. Let me talk about what I was talking about at the beginning of the call, and if it doesn't match here, you can redirect.

I've been sitting in various sessions, as many of you have, where people have had some experience with the RDRS. People have been sharing some of their experience. My sense is that these are happening in a kind of so pipe fashion within each of the different constituencies or forums that we're in. I thought it would be helpful to try to provide a venue for people who've had experience with the RDRS independent of where they're coming from or what group they're part of, just to share their experiences and their comments, no promise that doing that will cause anything to happen, except put it on the record. So that's one aspect of it.

A different is no limitation on what you're allowed to say. Some of these meetings have been characterized by quick responses, either from staff

or from contracted parties saying, "That's out of scope." I think there's utility in gathering and having a place to say all of this, and then deferring the question of what happens to those comments, but at least having that on the record. Also, not to waste time on why it came to be that way or other extraneous issues, a handful of us are trying to put together that session. I'm expecting the pieces to either come together or not over the next 48 hours or less, and then we'll start communicating broadly to let people know when, where, and invite people, and so forth.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Which day are you targeting?

STEVE CROCKER: This is tentative and not yet nailed down, but the current discussion is Tuesday, 5th of March, 9:00 am. And hopefully, with support from more than one constituency, but perhaps just one if it falls apart. I don't know, it's looking good so far. But I tried to be very careful about overanticipating.

STEVE DELBIANCO: I would like to suggest that the BC be included with the constituencies that would support that, if you haven't already said so.

STEVE CROCKER: That's exactly what I want to hear. But I'm glad to hear it from you instead of from me.

EN

STEVE DELBIANCO: Very good. Marie, hand is up.

MARIE PATTULLO: Thank you. If I can follow on from that, you will know Lori who is the president of the IPC. She has put together a suggestion about RDRS user group, if you like. Not user group, sorry. User meeting discussing the issues we are going through. I don't know that Steve Crocker is involved in that. What we are currently discussing in the CSG is that we take the CSG session that we have at 9:00 on Tuesday and dedicate it to this issue to the RDRS. So, Mason will be able to tell you more about that as well. Surprise, I know we haven't yet heard from the ISPs. But it does seem, at least to Mason and I and Lori, it does seem like a sensible way forward. Thanks.

STEVE CROCKER: That's exactly what I've been referring to. I want to be very careful about speaking for anybody else. But Lori and I have been working on this, and a couple others. So, Marie, thank you that you're confirming that what I have thought is going on is actually in progress and hit it all in the same direction.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve, take a look at the chat. Ching Chiao asked the same question that you and I put to staff on the last call we had on RDRS. There isn't clarity when one puts a request in, if the type of the request is a cybersecurity driven request or is the entity doing the requesting in the profession or

the type of an entity as a cybersecurity professional. Staff headed both ways in the report. But when one fills out the form, I believe they're just representing the nature of the request as opposed to the identity of the requester. So the absence of stats is because ICANN doesn't really know which they need.

STEVE CROCKER: Well, this falls directly into the kind of comments that we want to gather. As I said, I think it's important to gather them without trying to say, "Oh, this will happen," or "That will happen," or "It won't happen." Leave the disposition for a separate setting.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Okay. Thank you very much. Do we have any comments from Imran about subsequent rounds? Imran or Ching? Okay. The CCOICI, they put out a satisfaction survey about whether they should continue to push this framework for continuous improvement. They want that survey results logged by the 5th of March. They asked that each constituency should discuss it and submit a single survey response per constituency. So we would presumably go in to San Juan already having discussed our responses to the survey, it is attached to the policy calendar, the Survey Monkey document.

So, Mason, I would be most grateful if one of our councilors or former councilors were helping with this, because it's very much steeped in terms of what GNSO Council has in mind for the framework, and it's difficult for others who haven't been on Council to understand. Can I get

a volunteer among the current or former councilors to lead the way of drafting our responses to the survey?

LAWRENCE OLAWALE-ROBERTS: I will just want to add, Steve, that it will be very good if we can get help from Marie on this. I don't know for whatever reason, but the team itself is asking that those of us who currently serve should not be responsible for the input. But looking at the survey, it covers a lot about what has happened previously. And I'm sure Marie will have a lot of context in this regard, the SOI, Work Stream 2. I'm sure we will benefit a lot from her guidance. I don't know if this will put her on the spot.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Yeah, Marie, I'm about to turn this over to you to go through Channel 3, and hopefully that will give you a few minutes to think about whether you can take the lead on that. But I'll turn it over to you now.

MARIE PATTULLO: Yeah. Lawrence, can you give me a timeline? It's just I'm very tied up with external meetings next week. But I'll certainly try.

STEVE DELBIANCO: It's due the 5th of March. I think if you were to go through the Survey Monkey doc, attach what you think—

MARIE PATTULLO:	I will certainly go through it and see what I can do in the next two or three days. Okay?

STEVE DELBIANCO:	Fantastic. Then Lawrence and I will take it from there and get the rest of BC on board. Thank you for starting us on that track. Thank you, Marie. Go ahead.

MARIE PATTULLO:	Okay. I'll keep this quick because I know we're running against the clock. We have at last started the famous Team 14. We've only had one meeting. Paul McGrady is our facilitator. We've agreed that we're going to be meeting once a month. Hopefully, we'll also see each other in San Juan. I'll keep you posted on that.
	You know that we were trying to get a full intersessional for one day at Kigali. We've been told no because the ICANN staff are too tied up with planning for the high-level ministerial that's also happening on Rwanda. We haven't yet decided what kind of requests we're going to make instead. We think it's important that our house does talk to each other face to face. It has been pointed out that the contracted parties have a three-day intersessional. But we're not allowed one day on the side of an ICANN meeting, which is a little disappointing.
	The schedule for San Juan, please do sign up. Even if, unfortunately, you can't join us in person, you need to sign up to get all the access links.
	You've already heard what we just said about there being a possibility of that one you see that Steve's highlighted, the first on Tuesday, the CSG

EN

meeting. Not yet confirmed, but might be all about the RDRS from our perspective. So, really practical. So please, please come.

The NCPH, we don't really have much of an agenda at the moment. We're trying to work on that. The Board, as you know, they've asked us one question. We are preparing our questions for that. Again, at the moment, what we've got is more on NIS2. Not a surprise. More on RDRS, not a surprise. And what are the next steps on DNS abuse after the contract amendments? Again, not a surprise. So we are firming up the wording on that. Again, we don't have much from the IPC at the moment, but we will do by next week because that's the deadline.

I think that's all from me for now, Steve, unless anyone has any queries.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Questions for Marie? Marie and Mason, it might be good to discuss what we're working on with respect to a CSG response or meeting with CPH on DNS abuse and where do we go from here.

MARIE PATTULLO: Sure, absolutely. But I'll hand that to Mason because I won't be in that meeting.

MASON COLE: No, I'm glad you raised that, Steve, thank you, because I was going to do that under AOB. This is for all members. We have a scheduled meeting with Contracted Party House on Tuesday, 20 February. That'll be at 15:00 UTC. Again, Tuesday, the 20th, at 15:00 UTC. You should have in

your inbox or you have received in your inbox an invitation from me that I passed along from the Contracted Party House. Every BC member is welcome to attend and encouraged to attend. The ExCom met earlier in the week to map out some points that we want to raise with Contracted Party House. We're happy to lead the discussion, but it would be very good if we had BC participation on that call. So I hope you can make time for it.

STEVE DELBIANCO: All right, displayed on the screen, Mason, was the comments we filed this [inaudible]. This is the basis of our concerns about what will happen on the contract amendments, as well as the guidance issued by ICANN. And we're going to rely heavily on these approved BC positions when we bring things up with the CPH. We're trying not to plow any new ground that would require further member approval, but rather reiterate things you've all agreed to. Back to you, Mason.

MASON COLE: Thank you.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Alan?

ALAN WOODS: Thank you so much. I suppose, again, coming from a weird place because I was so involved in the negotiations. But I think whilst talking to the contracted parties, one of the things that might be very helpful

and beneficial is not just necessarily their response. But I think at this point, we need to focus a little bit on ICANN themselves and say, "Look, we have gotten this milestone, this is great. What are you going to do to now enforce it? What are the plans that you have in place?" I think that's the next step of clarity that we should really be looking for. And that is, how exactly are you going to achieve this now? Speaking as a person who was in the contracted parties, an awful lot of the emphasis was we're doing this because we want this to be enforced. So now the question is, well, how's it going to be?

STEVE DELBIANCO: Am I glad you're on our side of the house. Could you please make sure you clear your calendar to be there?

ALAN WOODS: I am there, don't worry.

STEVE DELBIANCO: Great. Thank you. But Alan, familiarize yourself, please, with the document I have on the screen. I will put the link into the chat as part of our standard BC positions. So if you're able to familiarize yourself with that, it'll really guide what we should say. Thank you. Mason, over to you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Steve. Any quick follow-ups for Steve on item two on the agenda, please? That was very healthy discussion. It took most of the

hour. So once again, our friend Tim Smith is under the gun to handle item number three. I know, Steve, yeah, we have a lot to cover. Tim, would you please go ahead with a quick report on financial administration, please?

TIM SMITH:

I sure can. Thanks a lot. When you put together the agenda, Mason, and you allow 20 minutes for me, I don't know that I'll ever be able to talk for 20 minutes. So you can certainly abbreviate that.

Very little to report, actually, right at the moment. But you mentioned Jeffrey Gabriel from Saw Technologies on the call. So, welcome, new member. Glad to have you here on your first meeting. We are also in the process of onboarding a couple of new people. Mark Daniel of Domain Holdings Group and [inaudible] of Domain Summit, Limited. So those will be joining us. I'm so happy to have new members with us. I did receive a notice today of one termination of membership. So that was unfortunate. But that does happen from time to time.

There are some payments that we are expecting from some of the existing members. So we'll be watching for that and following up with those over the coming days as well. I guess the next thing to come will be invoices going out for FY25 in the next while so. So keep an eye out for those as well.

I guess one of the other things that we did, and if you go to the BC website from time to time, bc-icann.org, you will see that we posted a poster—and thanks for Vivek and Mia for bringing that forward—for the Nominating Committee, and there are seven open leadership positions.

I think the period ends on March 15. So we thought a little bit of extra promotion would be to put this poster at the ICANN website. So just to let you know about that.

Also, as it relates to ICANN79, there will be a session, I guess it's a Fellows session, which will be on the Sunday morning. Lawrence and Arinola will be presenting on behalf of the BC. So I guess you're all familiar with the BC so you may not need to attend, but it certainly is for Fellows. Thanks to Lawrence and Arinola for doing that.

Also, Marie had it in her report that the schedule for Prep Week has now been posted. Actually, the schedule for all of ICANN has now been posted. And during Prep Week, there is a session on FY25 Finance and Operations, and I'll be attending that. Anybody else who wants to join me can do that, of course. But I will be attending on your behalf.

Beyond that, I think the next thing that I just wanted to keep you up to date on, and the deadline is coming, is the newsletter that we would like to have out for ICANN79. It will not be a printed newsletter. It will be an e-newsletter, which of course we will link at and post at the ICANN website, at the BC website. But the deadline is coming up. I know, Mason, you'll have something to present for that. I know Yusuph has already committed, and hopefully you're still preparing your piece, Yusuph, for that. There's room for more articles. So I encourage people on this call to submit articles for the BC newsletter. You can see an example of last one at, again, the BC website, if you want to take a look at what it looks like. But I need those—it's right around the corner—February 22, which is a week from today. That's our deadline in order to

get the materials together to the designer to be able to get it turned around and posted before or in a couple of days before ICANN79.

So that's really it for me. Thank you very much. I'll take any questions. Jimson, I see your hand up.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Tim. You really hit the ground running. I appreciate the feedback. As we look ahead to FY25, can you give us a projection of where we can get the expense breakdown for FY23 and the budget for FY24? Can we expect the projection of when that will be available?

TIM SMITH: Well, I'll tell you. To tell you the truth, I haven't thought about FY23. At the moment, I have been thinking about FY24 and I'm in the process of working on bringing the expenses up to date. I have to dig into those. So I'm working on that. Also, I'm just starting to work on FY25, which I'll do, obviously, once I have FY24 in hand. What I need to do is go through the documents, going back to the beginning of FY24 in July, and bringing them up to date up to January. So I'm in the process of doing that. And once I get that done, I'll be working on FY25. So I don't have a specific date for you right at the moment, Jimson, but I am working on it.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Okay. Thank you very much.

MASON COLE: Okay, Tim. All set?

TIM SMITH: Yes. Thank you. Right on time.

MASON COLE: All right. Thank you for that report.

TIM SMITH: There'll be much time, if you want, for AOB.

MASON COLE: Any follow-ups for Tim, please? All right, if I may, if I can indulge BC members for just one more minute, I'm going to put Mia and Vivek on the spot, because Tim just mentioned the recruiting poster we put up on the website for NomCom. I just wanted to ask Mia and Vivek, is there any further update on NomCom activity that we need to be aware of as BC?

VIVEK GOYAL: Mia, if you don't mind, I'll just say a few words there. We in the NomCom that are looking at candidate profiles and selecting candidates are kind of bound by the applications that come in. That's the pool. We have to select somebody from that. So I request all BC members, please circulate the requirements for the job, the positions that are open for the job as widely as you can, because the candidates that we get, that is a starting point. The better candidates we get, those candidates end up

making ICANN better with their experience and their work. You know having experience in ICANN is not mandatory for some of these positions? So even if somebody has experience in policy somewhere else, or has a lot of business experience, they can also join these positions and bring in a lot of expertise. So I request you all to please circulate this as wide as you can. If you have any questions, or if they have any questions about these positions, feel free to put them in touch with me. Mia and I will be happy to help and answer any questions. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Fantastic. Thank you very much.

MIA BRICKHOUSE: I'll just add one more thing. I believe in the past, we usually receive a lot of last minute applications. So if anyone is considering or knows folks that might be interested, I would just encourage them to try and get it in sooner rather than later to help. As Vivek mentioned, get the right candidates to the top of the list. Thank you.

MASON COLE: Thank you, Mia. Thank you, Vivek. Very helpful. I appreciate that reminder. NomCom activity is very important to the BC. We have two representatives, which is something the rest of the community doesn't really enjoy. And we need to make the most of the work that Mia and Vivek are putting in. So please do help in their efforts on the NomCom.

EN

All right. I think that's it. Is there any other business for the BC today? All right, I don't see any hands. Brenda, can you please remind us about the time and location of the meeting in Puerto Rico for the BC, please?

BRENDA BREWER: Hi, Mason, thank you. Our BC Membership meeting is on Tuesday, the 5th, I believe that is, sorry. Tuesday, the 5th of March, and it is 1:15 in the afternoon, and that's Puerto Rico time. So I hope you can all join us either remotely or in person. I will be sending save the date calendar notices. So you can look at the ICANN79 schedule. So be sure you're registered, as Marie noted, register for ICANN79. I'll send an e-mail out before the end of the day tomorrow, with links to join or register for ICANN79, and then you can see the schedule. So there you go.

MASON COLE: All right. Thanks, Brenda. Very helpful. Just one last reminder, again, Tuesday, 20 February, 15:00 UTC is our BC discussion with Contracted Party House on DNS abuse. If you need a reminder on that time and location, just send me an e-mail and I'll connect you.

Okay, if there's no other business then we will see you all in Puerto Rico. Safe trip to everyone. Thank you for the robust discussion today. Thank you, Brenda, for the support. And the BC is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]